DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 447 888 JC 010 056

TITLE	Meeting New Leadership Challenges in the Community Colleges.
INSTITUTION	Community Coll. Leadership Development Initiative, CA.; Claremont Graduate Univ., CA.
PUB DATE	2000-09-00
NOTE	17p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Community Colleges; Institutional Role; *Leadership Training; *Partnerships in Education; *Program Development; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*Claremont Graduate School CA

ABSTRACT

In April 2000, the Community College Leadership Development Initiative (CCLDI) and the Claremont Graduate University (CGU) in California entered into a landmark partnership to improve the leadership of the community colleges. This partnership is notable for several reasons: it envisions a multifaceted, long-term effort to improve community college leadership based upon mutual commitments from a leading, doctoral-level university and leaders from the community colleges; it defines "leadership" inclusively to embrace responsible roles within the ranks of trustees, faculty, and administrators; it accords the community colleges a strong and continuing role in shaping the academic preparation of its own leaders; and its success depends upon the active participation of both public and private universities throughout our region. This document explains the reasons for the partnership and the basic nature of its plans, as of May 2000. Part I, the "Challenge to Leadership," defines the leadership challenge as seen by the Board of CCLDI following a yearlong process of consultation with community college colleagues and university representatives. Part II, "Our Response: Creating a Community College Leadership Institute," outlines the partnership's plans to meet the leadership challenge. An appendix contains more detailed reports on the results of administrative and faculty surveys that helped shape the partnership's plans and summary of discussions with universities in 1999. (VWC)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 447 888

MEETING NEW

leadership challenges

IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

I Hernandez

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

PARTNERSHIP FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEADERSHIP

CCLDI
Community College
Leadership Development Initiative

Claremont
GRADUATE UNIVERSITY

RC018056

September 2000

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

LEON P. BARADAT
Professor of Political Science,
MiraCosta Community College

GEORGE R. BOGGS
President, American Association of
Community Colleges

CONSTANCE M. CARROLL (CHAIR)
President, San Diego Mesa College

CAROLE CURREY
Member, Board of Trustees
Santa Monica Community College District

GERALD HAYWARD
Former Chancellor,
California Community Colleges

JACK HERNANDEZ
Professor of Philosophy, Bakersfield College

MARTHA KANTER
President, DeAnza College

PETER MACDOUGALL
President, Santa Barbara City College

TOM NUSSBAUM
Chancellor, California Community Colleges

JOHN C. PETERSEN
Former Executive Director, Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges

BILL SCROGGINS (VICE-CHAIR)
Professor of Chemistry, Chabot College and Immediate Past President, Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

JOYCE S. TSUNODA (VICE-CHAIR)
Senior Vice President and Chancellor for Community Colleges, University of Hawaii

DAVID L. VIAR
Executive Director, Community College League of California

STAFF

DAVID B. WOLF
Administrative Officer, Executive Director, Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges

STEPHEN S. WEINER
Consultant and Former President, Board of Governors, California Community Colleges

"Because leadership development for our current and next generation of trustee, administrative and faculty leaders will have everything to do with the quality of community college education in the future, the CCLDI is of major importance."

Tom Nussbaum,
Chancellor, California Community Colleges

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table of Contents

Introduction 4

Part I. The Challenge to Leadership 6

Part II. Our Response: Creating a Community College Leadership Institute 8

A. The Community College Leadership Institute 9

1. Doctoral Fellows Program 9
2. Leadership Fellows Program 10
3. Certificate Program for New Community College Leadership 11
4. Intensive Summer Workshop in Community College Leadership 11
5. Information Dissemination and Research 12

B. Conclusion 12

Attachment I: Results of the Feasibility Study 13

A. Survey of Administrative Leaders 13

1. The Doctoral Degree 13
2. Non-Doctoral Programs 14
3. Institutional Support for Graduate Study 14

B. Survey of Faculty Leaders 14

C. Discussions with Universities. 15

INTRODUCTION

In April 2000, the Community College Leadership Development Initiative (CCLDI) and the Claremont Graduate University (CGU) entered into a landmark Partnership to improve the leadership of the community colleges.

This partnership is notable for several reasons:

• The Partnership envisions a multifaceted, long-term effort to improve community college leadership based upon mutual commitments from a leading, doctoral-level university and leaders from the community colleges. Thus, the Partnership will draw upon wisdom developed through experience in the community colleges as well as the scholarship of the university community.

• The Partnership defines "leadership" inclusively to embrace responsible roles within the ranks of trustees, faculty and administrators.

• The Partnership accords the community colleges, for the first time, a strong and continuing role in shaping the academic preparation, at the graduate level, of its own leaders. Correspondingly, the Partnership rests upon the commitment of the community colleges to identify its leadership needs and to actively support the fulfillment of these needs.

• The Partnership's success depends upon the active participation of both public and private universities throughout our region, not just the Claremont Graduate University. These universities are cordially invited to participate in the Partnership.

The document that follows explains the reasons for the Partnership and the basic nature of its plans, as of May 2000. Part 1, the Challenge to Leadership, defines the leadership challenge as seen by the Board of CCLDI following a yearlong process of consultation with community college colleagues and university representatives. Part 2, Our Response: Creating a Community College Leadership Institute, outlines the Partnership's plans to meet the leadership challenge. An appendix contains more detailed reports on the results of administrative and faculty surveys that helped shape our plans and a summary of discussions with universities in 1999.

The plans in Part 2 are a work in progress and will be further examined and revised during a Design Workshop to be held in late June 2000. CGU and CCLDI gratefully acknowledge a grant from the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation to underwrite the Workshop.

As the design workshop moves forward, the Partnership is also seeking financial support to make our plans a reality. Explorations of both public and private funding are underway.

We welcome comments, suggestions and expressions of interest. They should be directed to: David B. Wolf, Administrative Officer of CCLDI, at 3402 Mendocino Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA. 95403. E-mail address: accjcdbw@AOL.com. **Members of the Board of CCLDI welcome invitations to participate in discussions of community college leadership development and the Partnership's plans. Such invitations should be directed to the address above.**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

LEON P. BARADAT
Professor of Political Science,
MiraCosta Community College

GEORGE R. BOGGS
President, American Association of
Community Colleges

CONSTANCE M. CARROLL (CHAIR)
President, San Diego Mesa College

CAROLE CURREY
Member, Board of Trustees
Santa Monica Community College District

GERALD HAYWARD
Former Chancellor,
California Community Colleges

JACK HERNANDEZ
Professor of Philosophy, Bakersfield College

MARTHA KANTER
President, DeAnza College

PETER MACDOUGALL
President, Santa Barbara City College

TOM NUSSBAUM
Chancellor, California Community Colleges

JOHN C. PETERSEN
Former Executive Director, Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges

BILL SCROGGINS (VICE-CHAIR)
Professor of Chemistry, Chabot College and Immediate Past President, Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

JOYCE S. TSUNODA (VICE-CHAIR)
Senior Vice President and Chancellor for Community Colleges, University of Hawaii

DAVID L. VIAR
Executive Director, Community College
League of California

STAFF

DAVID B. WOLF
Administrative Officer, Executive Director, Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges

STEPHEN S. WEINER
Consultant and Former President, Board of Governors, California Community Colleges

"Because leadership development for our current and next generation of trustee, administrative and faculty leaders will have everything to do with the quality of community college education in the future, the CCLDI is of major importance."

Tom Nussbaum,
Chancellor, California Community Colleges

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PART I
THE CHALLENGE TO LEADERSHIP

In November 1998, we sounded an alarm.

Our alarm spoke to the mounting difficulties faced by community college leadership, at all levels, within the western region (California, Hawaii, Guam and the Pacific Islands). We were worried that, without stronger leadership, our ability to educate the 1,500,000 students who depend upon the public two-year colleges could be endangered.

In 1999, we undertook a study to sharpen our understanding of the leadership challenge and to explore what might be done about it. Our study incorporated several elements:

- Written communication and personal conversations with dozens of community college leaders throughout our region by members of CCLDI.
- Meetings with leaders of the University of California, the California State University and several private universities about the leadership development challenge before us.
- A mailed survey to administrative and faculty leadership of two-year colleges throughout our region.

Several meetings of CCLDI were held to review our findings. Encouraged by the positive response of our colleagues in the community colleges, we incorporated CCLDI as a new non-profit organization under the laws of California.

Our first meeting in July 1998 had been held at the request of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. The Commission, based upon its reading of visiting team reports to scores of two-year colleges in recent years, had witnessed stresses and strains that reduced the ability of responsible college leaders (be they trustees, administrators or faculty members) to set sound directions for their campuses.

We knew from studies conducted by the Community College League of California that presidential tenures had become shorter. In California, in 1977, 28% of chief executive officers had held their position for 10 or more years. By 1997 that proportion had been reduced to 13%. We also knew that average length of tenure for a community college chief executive officer in California was 4.4 years compared to an average 7.5 year tenure nationally. Most troubling were the reports of chief executive officers surviving less than 2 or 3 years and departing amidst evident political wrangling.

Certainly there are times when the arrival of new leadership represents a gain for a campus. However, we know that when leadership survives for only a few years that essential processes of planning and decision-making may well come to a halt. Indeed, when leadership changes become incessant and chaotic, then entire campuses are likely to suffer confusion and loss of morale leading to a deterioration of institutional effectiveness.

However, a quickening turnover of chief executive officers is not conclusive proof of a leadership problem. We were more concerned by a consensus within our group that key administrative positions now attract smaller numbers of well-qualified candidates than in earlier years. Further, there seems to be a marked reduction in the number of experienced faculty members willing to seek or assume administrative leadership or the leadership of faculty organizations. A faculty senate member responded to our faculty survey: "We destroy our leaders through burnout. They have no time to get trained. Faculty leaders are not identified. They are often discouraged. We have not had two candidates run for any faculty leadership position in years. Only those willing to be abused and overworked run for the positions."

We speculated on the reasons why, to copy President Harry Truman, the heat in the leadership kitchen had become too hot for potential leaders. The national decline of public confidence in a wide variety of institutions plays a role as does the explosive growth of the community colleges. (To quote two statistics: in California credit enrollment has grown

7 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

from 16,000 students at 39 campuses immediately after World War II to 1,400,000 students at 106 campuses in 1998). We noted the loss of a sense of community in many geographic areas served by community colleges and we reviewed the loss of local community college autonomy to the state (especially but not exclusively as a result of the loss of taxing power at the local level).

We are enormously proud to be associated with the community colleges. Our colleges respond quickly and well to the educational and training needs of our society. Our colleges embrace the diversity that is the future of the United States. In every respect, the community colleges are the avenue for the realization of educational aspirations vital to our democratic system. American community colleges are, indeed, a precious national asset with a unique local focus.

But our pride does not blind us to a profoundly disquieting reality on too many campuses in our region.

The community college "movement" has faltered. In earlier decades the word "movement" bespoke a belief in responsiveness to community needs as well as professional and disciplinary dictates; exaltation of teaching and advising as the critical characteristics of excellence in community college faculty; a willingness and capacity to teach students who come from many different educational backgrounds and levels of preparation. These values remain alive on community college campuses but they are now too often crowded out by a growing emphasis on identification with special interest groups and a growth in adversarial relationships among groups whether it be faculty vs. administration; CEO vs. Board; academic senate vs. unions; and/or other feuds.

There is no longer an emotional commitment to institutional mission on many campuses strong enough to temper many parochial demands. As a result, leadership (be it faculty, administrative or trustee) is pinned down in the resulting cross-fire among contending factions.

In the most extreme cases, political factions prevent campuses from making important decisions; they capture part or all of a governing board and turn the board into an instrument of meddling and divisiveness on campus; and launch personal attacks on leaders sufficiently persistent and poisonous that they not only disable elected, administrative, and faculty leaders but ruin careers as well.

As if all of this were not enough, community colleges now face demands for service exceeding financial capacity, the uncertain but costly impact of technological change, and unprecedented competition for students, programs and funding.

Community college leaders will always face tough problems. What is required now are practical steps to deepen the base of knowledge upon which community college leaders can work and to provide the means and opportunity for engagement both with scholarly work and the practical wisdom of other community college leaders.

"Leaders and potential leaders are already present within our local colleges and districts. The goal of the CCLDI is to identify, nurture and develop these grassroots talents to the fullest."

Joyce Tsunoda,
Senior Vice President and Chancellor
for Community Colleges,
University of Hawaii

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PART II
OUR RESPONSE:
Creating a Community College Leadership Institute

Leadership in the community colleges has suffered from benign neglect. There is little conscious attention paid to questions of where community college leaders will come from, how their talents will be developed and their experience valued. If one looks to the university community, and especially the University of California, where so much attention is paid to preparing leaders for the basic professions such as law, business, public administration and medicine, then the community colleges typically fail to appear on the radar scope, even in schools of education.

We hope to end this period of neglect. We intend to create an environment where talented individuals will be drawn to leadership roles and where they will receive the necessary involvement and support of the entire college community. We will work at a regional level, looking beyond a sole preoccupation with California, because the variety and diversity of culture and institutional histories will enrich the results for all.

Some leadership development needs within the community colleges are being addressed. A variety of professional organizations now provide an array of helpful short-term programs to address the needs of those serving in particular roles such as trustees, chief executive officers, chief instructional officers, student service officers, business officers and academic senate leaders.

What is missing are endeavors that encourage deeper study and reflection about the dynamics and future of the community colleges; that bring together leaders across trustee, faculty and administrative lines; and that build active cooperation between community college leadership and centers of scholarly work.

Working as a group of volunteers, the CCLDI Board sees our special mission as sponsoring leadership development programs that link the idealism, talent and experience of community college professionals with the scholarly abilities and long-term view of university faculty. Through this linkage we seek to examine our performance as educational institutions; to understand the dynamics of our complex campuses; and to recommit ourselves to the fundamental social and educational values that bring our college communities together.

In order to accomplish this mission CCLDI entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with the Claremont Graduate University in April 2000. This Memorandum marks the culmination of eighteen months of exploration and discussion between CGU and CCLDI and benefited from consultation with other public and independent universities whom we hope will join in the Partnership that has now been created.

Claremont Graduate University is an independent, graduate-only institution conferring master's and doctoral degrees in a variety of arts and sciences and professional fields. Established in 1925, CGU is one of seven independent colleges, located in Claremont, California, that together comprise the Claremont Colleges consortium. CGU's School of Educational Studies hosts an array of academic degree programs and research institutes.

At the core of the new CGU-CCLDI Partnership will be a Community College Leadership Institute to be created within the University. This Institute will have an ambitious agenda including:

- Doctoral Fellows
- Leadership Fellows
- Certificate Programs for New Community College Leaders
- Intensive Summer Workshop in Community College Leadership
- Information Dissemination and Research

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A. Community College Leadership Institute

The new Institute will embrace an inclusive definition of leadership and bring together trustees, administrators and faculty. In this way, understanding of key community college leadership roles can be enhanced and a broader view of the needs of community colleges achieved. The Institute will serve both established and aspiring leaders.

The Institute will strengthen community college leadership throughout our region by linking academic study and professional development opportunities and by relating those activities to important policy and research issues at the regional, national and international levels.

The Institute will seek collaborative relations with other enterprises and training programs that serve the community colleges. In this respect, we propose that the Institute serve as a central reference source to enable interested persons to learn about the full range of programs, many of a short-term nature, offered by professional organizations for community college leaders. Such information could be made available in hard copy and on the World Wide Web. With such information in hand, it would be possible to detect both overlaps in program offerings and important topics not being addressed. The Institute might decide to convene sponsors of leadership development programs from time to time to discuss voluntary coordination of their programs.

The Institute would also seek to work with state entities in California, Hawaii, and the Pacific territories (including the Chancellors of the California and Hawaii systems and the California Postsecondary Education Commission) as well as the ERIC Clearinghouse at UCLA to develop an inventory of resources germane to community college education.

"Community colleges in our region are in the midst of a leadership development drought of unprecedented proportions. College presidents are stepping down after just a handful of years at the helm. Seasoned faculty leaders find it difficult to locate those in the next generation who will step up to the plate. The need to develop current and new educational leaders, from the classroom to the board room, is an urgent public policy issue. The CCLDI has constructed a flexible strategy, which can be implemented almost immediately and reflects a grassroots origin in its simplicity, elegance and breadth."

Bill Scroggins,
Professor of Chemistry, Chabot College; Past President, Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

1. Doctoral Fellows Program

Doctoral Fellows will be individuals committed to leadership in the community colleges who will pursue (or, in some instances, who are currently pursuing) doctoral work at universities throughout the region. Those selected as Doctoral Fellows will, in addition to their regular doctoral studies at participating universities, gain access to a co-curricular program providing an in-depth, multiple-year experience. This co-curricular experience will focus on concepts about education, society, methods of inquiry and leadership that will help equip a new generation of community college leaders within both administrative and faculty ranks.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Doctoral Fellows will be brought together on a regular basis, in different settings throughout the region, for meetings with educational leaders and scholars. These sessions will encourage:

- exposure to national and international issues that place the western region in a larger context;
- direct access to leaders both within and outside the community college sector;
- ties to other professional organizations working with and on behalf of the community college sector;
- clarity regarding research and policy issues important to the community colleges and connections with leaders in the higher education research and policy communities;
- collaborative research projects among the Doctoral Fellows;
- activities to ensure success in the doctoral experience and building a commitment to leadership and service;

Doctoral Fellows will be nominated by colleges, universities, districts and, potentially, professional organizations serving the community colleges. We envision that the Institute will be a clearinghouse for information about the doctoral programs offered by participating public and private universities.

Doctoral Fellows will apply to doctoral institutions of their choosing within the region. The individual graduate institutions, including CGU, will make admissions and financial aid decisions. (The CGU-CCLDI partnership will seek funding to make the tuition costs of individual doctoral programs more affordable for Doctoral Fellows.) The Doctoral Fellows themselves will make the final decision as to the institution where their doctoral studies will be undertaken.

Later this year CGU will convene a meeting with public and private graduate institutions in our region who may be interested in participating in the Doctoral Fellows Program and other efforts of the Community College Leadership Institute.

2. Leadership Fellows Program

As demonstrated by our surveys of both administrators and faculty, not all leadership development activities can or should be focused on those individuals pursuing doctoral study. The Leadership Fellows Program will provide a vehicle for promising leaders that does not require completion of academic coursework. The Leadership Fellows Program will run parallel to, and at points intersect with, the Doctoral Fellows Program.

The core concept is to provide a rich professional development experience, probably spanning two years, for successive cohorts of promising leaders. Leadership Fellows will be able to engage with insightful leaders and thinkers in the community colleges while studying ideas relevant to the challenges that face their institutions. Through this Program, Leadership Fellows will gain the opportunity for networking, reflection, creative thinking and mentoring.

The activities of the Leadership Fellows Program will include regional seminars (some held in conjunction with Doctoral Fellows), participation in intensive summer institutes, and ongoing discussions of issues, research and policy proposals through electronic means.

As in the Doctoral Fellows Program, Leadership Fellows will be drawn from the ranks of those already working in community colleges within the region and will be nominated, based upon leadership potential, by colleges, districts and professional organizations. Some Leadership Fellows will already be holders of the doctoral degree.

"The CCLDI, which has the promise of making relevant, demanding community college leadership development programs accessible to current and future leaders of Pacific colleges, has my full support."

Susan Moses, President, College of Micronesia FSM; Chairperson, Pacific Postsecondary Education Council

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

3. Certificate Program for New Community College Leadership

Many community college leaders, be they trustees, officials of faculty organizations, or mid-level administrators, have had no formal preparation for community college leadership. Some of these individuals already have a doctorate in an academic discipline. Many of these individuals do not wish to pursue a degree program or to commit themselves to a lengthy non-degree program such as the Leadership Fellows Program.

For this important audience, we envision a broadly available certificate program for community college leaders that would include a coherent set of courses that would address the history of the community colleges, current knowledge and practice regarding pedagogy for the diverse community college student body, governance and political issues, techniques for team building and conflict resolution, and useful modes of planning and financial analysis. The New Community College Leadership Institute will encourage the California State University, the University of Hawaii, and independent institutions to design such programs and offer them throughout the region.

4. Intensive Summer Workshop in Community College Leadership

As noted in the survey of administrative leaders (see Attachment I), "an extended summer program in advanced management," is the program most strongly endorsed by administrators. We believe that the enthusiasm for intensive summer programs reflects, at least in part, the extreme difficulty of finding time to reflect on institutional and leadership issues in the daily press of community college life and the need for "time out" to think and to talk with professional colleagues in an unhurried and supportive environment. We hope to see such a program offered no later than the summer of 2001 under the sponsorship of the new Community College Leadership Institute.

It is essential that an intensive summer workshop, perhaps of 2 or 3 weeks duration, be quite distinct from other meetings and conferences that occupy community college leaders during the balance of the year. Thus, we intend that such a summer workshop not focus on training in narrow skills, such as budget preparation or modes of strategic planning, nor should it absorb time in discussions of transitory issues such as pending state legislation.

We hope that participants in such a summer workshop would realize four goals:

A. Strengthen their passion to play a leadership role in the community colleges.

B. Enlarge their perception of what institutional leadership can mean and to test their own assumptions as to the nature of leadership.

C. Grapple with the difficult ethical choices that are inherent in institutional leadership.

D. Become members of a new collegial network in which they can find support and inspiration in the future.

The summer workshops should serve both established leaders and persons about to assume positions of institution-wide leadership. In certain portions of the program these groups might meet separately, but for the most part they should be together. The "student body" of the summer program, in addition to being drawn from different roles and differing levels of seniority, should be constituted to serve as teachers to one another. Applicants to the workshop should be reviewed with a concern as to their demonstrated capacity to be reflective and insightful about their own professional experiences. As with all Institute programs, diversity of participants with respect to ethnicity, gender and geography is important. We anticipate that Doctoral Fellows and Leadership Fellows might well benefit from participation in the intensive summer program.

The summer workshop could be designed as the first part of a year-long experience. Serious consideration should be given to reassembling the participants on a bi-monthly basis throughout the following year perhaps in varying locations to consider various topics.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

5. Information Dissemination and Research

An important element of the work of the Institute will be to identify important areas for research central to the development of the community colleges in collaboration with leadership in the region and with others. The Institute would serve as the home for a select number of high priority studies that would involve faculty and fellows from throughout the region.

In addition, in order to realize the goals of the Institute, it will be important to embed substantial dissemination and information resources into the work of the Institute. Web and print resources will be essential as well.

"Accreditors have noted the urgent need for graduate-level study and professional training, not only for the development of a new generation of leaders for the diverse range of community colleges in this region, but also as an avenue of renewal for present administrators, faculty leaders and trustees. CCLDI has designed an imaginative, practical and effective means for addressing this critical need."

Constance Carroll,
President, San Diego Mesa College;
Past Chair, Western Association of
Schools and Colleges
Accrediting Commission for
Community and Junior Colleges

B. Conclusion

There appears to be a broad consensus that leadership has been and will be an essential ingredient in determining the effectiveness of community colleges. In the western region these colleges are expected to respond appropriately to an increased number of students and a wide variety of societal issues.

In a short period of time the CCLDI has been able to articulate the major issues that are confronting those who would lead community colleges in the coming years. We have been able to assess the existing opportunities for the development of these leaders and have found these programs of limited size and variety.

The CCLDI has also developed a framework for greatly expanding leadership development opportunities and fitting them to the variety of trustee, administrator and faculty leadership needs that we have identified.

The CCLDI is very much a work in progress. We will soon be engaged in a major Design Workshop, from which greater elaboration of the framework and particular program elements will result. As we work toward the implementation of specific programmatic initiatives, the CCLDI will be releasing Progress Reports such that all interested parties will be fully informed. We thank you for your interest and support.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ATTACHMENT I
RESULTS OF THE FEASIBILITY STUDY

A. Survey of Administrative Leaders

In March 1999, we sent a survey concerning leadership development to administrative leaders at two-year colleges, both public and private, within the Western region. Specifically, the survey was mailed to chief executive officers (CEOs), chief instructional officers (CIOs), chief student service officers (CSSOs), and chief business officers (CBOs) at 137 individual institutions and 21 "system" or district offices.

We received responses from at least one individual in each of 127 institutions and systems offices for an institutional response rate of 80%. This is a very high response rate and, we believe, strong evidence of the high saliency of the leadership development issue among administrative leaders.

Here are highlights from the survey of administrative leaders:

1. The Doctoral Degree

Some sort of doctoral degree is held by 86% of the chief executives who responded. Among other respondents 59% hold doctoral degrees. Almost two-thirds of the doctoral degrees held by CEOs are in Education (including the subfields of Higher Education and Educational Administration).

Two surprises awaited us in terms of where these doctoral degrees were conferred. First, approximately 40% of the doctoral degrees held by CEOs were granted by institutions outside of California and Hawaii and 75% of the out-of-region degrees were awarded by public universities. Second, among the doctoral degrees awarded in California, more than 80% were granted by independent universities, not the state's land grant university. Indeed, only 9 CEOs (approximately 10%) hold doctoral degrees from any campus of the University of California compared to 8 CEOs holding doctoral degrees from the University of Texas. Clearly, the University of California plays a minor role in the preparation of chief executive officers for community colleges in California compared to both public universities elsewhere and private universities within California. The University of Southern California alone has produced twice the number of doctoral degrees held by CEOs as compared with the University of California.

When asked to indicate those professional development opportunities "that would be important additions to existing opportunities," slightly more than one-half of all respondents checked "Ed.D programs in community college leadership." Clearly, one issue in this regard is the ease with which community college professionals can undertake these programs, particularly in those locales where a doctoral-degree granting institution is at a considerable distance. A one-year residency on campus, a requirement at universities who deem such residency to be an essential element of program quality, is a major hurdle for community college professionals who find relocation to be difficult, if not impossible.

> *"A fundamental responsibility of good leadership is to ensure the capacity of the organization in the future. Ensuring top quality leaders for tomorrow's community colleges is a responsibility of today's leaders. The CCLDI represents a sound approach to fulfill that responsibility."*
>
> Peter MacDougall,
> President, Santa Barbara City College

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2. Non-Doctoral Programs

Two-thirds of all respondents view "extended summer programs in advanced educational management" as an important addition to existing opportunities for professional development and, thus, is the only program option desired by more respondents than additional opportunities for doctoral study. Comments volunteered in connection with this question indicate that many view current summer offerings in a conference setting as so informal as to make such programs appear to be less than serious.

When asked to estimate the number of persons on each campus who would enroll in a graduate leadership program "if one were conveniently available," the total size of the estimated market was 450 individuals throughout the region. These estimates include likely enrollment in both doctoral and non-doctoral programs. The creation of "leadership networks to support various leadership specialties" was endorsed by 50% of all respondents.

3. Institutional Support for Graduate Study

The survey asked if community colleges and districts supported graduate study by granting release time, tuition assistance, salary recognition upon degree completion, or other means. About one-third of the respondents said their institutions provide salary recognition for completion of advanced degrees. Of course, this incentive only comes into play after the degree is completed. Faculty in graduate programs for community college professionals point to the importance of granting release time to their students. Disappointingly, only one-fifth of respondents stated that release time is available and only one-sixth stated that their colleges provide tuition assistance for graduate study. Fewer than one out of ten respondents indicated that sabbaticals were available to enable them to pursue graduate study. (The availability of sabbaticals may be understated since our survey did not list them specifically, leaving respondents to report them under the category of "other.") To state the matter bluntly, the policies of community colleges in our region communicate a clear sense that further graduate study for administrative leaders is not worthy of institutional support. We believe that such policies should be changed to reflect a high institutional priority for advanced graduate study that strengthens leadership talent on our campuses.

B. Survey of Faculty Leaders

We have received 355 responses to our faculty survey from faculty leaders at 83 institutions. The largest category of respondents was faculty with responsibility for departmental administrative affairs. Forty percent of respondents identified themselves as academic senate leaders and one out of seven said they represented faculty on issues of wages, hours and working conditions.

The following items emerge as highlights from a preliminary analysis of the data:

Less than half of the faculty respondents have received formal academic preparation for leadership in the form of a graduate degree or courses in higher education. A majority of faculty leaders want more education and training for leadership than they have received and, in particular, 65% of the respondents wish training of the type offered by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges and 61% desire more preparation for leadership that might be offered by their own campus. Only one-third of our faculty respondents desire to obtain a degree in higher education or take courses in leadership at another academic institution.

Faculty comments indicate a widespread perception that campus leaders are overloaded in terms of work and that leadership is not supported in their own institutional culture. They favor moving educators into leadership positions and relying upon local programs, include mentoring, as the best means to prepare faculty leaders for leadership responsibilities.

One-third of the faculty respondents indicated no personal interest in ever holding a senior administrative position. Among those who so aspire, the option of pursuing a doctoral degree appealed to only one in five. More attractive were "extended summer programs," which were desired by almost one-half of the respondents and internships, which were attractive to one-third of the respondents.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

As was the case with administrators, faculty perceive that their own institutions provide very little concrete support for leadership training.

C. Discussions with Universities

The November 1998, CCLDI's prospectus declared our intention to meet with university representatives "to determine their level of interest in cooperating with a proposed CCLDI and specifically establishing master's and doctoral programs in Community College Leadership that would be affiliated with the CCLDI."

Accordingly, in early 1999, we began contacting several campuses of the University of California as well as private universities having doctoral programs that enrolled significant numbers of community college professionals. In the first six months of 1999, we met with representatives of four University of California campuses (the Chancellor of UC Davis and the deans of Education at Berkeley, Los Angeles and Riverside). We contacted six private universities, which led to on-campus meetings at three independent campuses. We also met with the Chancellor and Executive Vice-Chancellor of the California State University.

Our meetings with university representatives generally had a three-part agenda:

1. We were interested in learning more about graduate-level programs for community college professionals.

2. We were interested to find out whether graduate institutions would be willing to work with CCLDI to form a network of such institutions both to increase enrollment and to enhance the quality of their programs through sharing good ideas and by having a close link to community college leaders via cooperation with CCLDI.

3. We sought to determine the interest and qualifications of individual universities to serve as a "lead campus" in such a CCLDI-University network. By "lead campus" we meant an institution that would periodically convene meetings of the network, become a center of community college scholarship, sponsor meetings focused on research about the community college, and sponsor one or more intensive summer institutes for community college leaders.

Without exception, in all of our conversations with university representatives, we found sincere interest in the community colleges and concern about the leadership challenges outlined in our November 1998, prospectus. In many cases, we were reminded that a large number of students attending each of these institutions begin their higher education studies in the community colleges and, therefore, the effectiveness of the community colleges is of direct concern to graduate institutions. Several of the private institutions also expressed interest in expanding enrollment of community college professionals in their graduate programs and/or responding to our concerns in other ways. In this respect we are especially grateful for the responses from the School of Education at the University of Southern California and the Claremont Graduate University.

Under California law, the California State University may only offer graduate degrees through the masters level and is prevented from offering doctoral degrees unless it does so with another university, public or private, who is authorized to grant doctoral degrees. Within that constraint, the Chancellor of the California State University expressed keen interest in joining efforts that would respond to community college needs for leadership development.

While we had useful and candid discussions on each of four University of California campuses, we found little reason to be optimistic about their ability to respond to the leadership challenge in the community colleges. Many community college professionals can remember strong centers of scholar-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ship and graduate education focused on the community colleges at both UC Berkeley and UCLA. These centers were largely supported by external foundation funding and with the expiration of those external funds, for all practical purposes, they are defunct. Key faculty in these programs have retired and they have not been succeeded by scholars focused on the community colleges nor, for that matter, on higher education more generally. UCLA continues to offer a doctoral program geared to both elementary/secondary and community college leaders. The Davis and Riverside campuses, both strongly imbued with the land-grant university tradition, are limited by the small size of their education units. Recently UC Riverside has expressed a new determination to respond to community college leadership needs. In all four campuses we found an understandable desire to meet the needs of elementary and secondary schools and an inability, in the face of budget limitations and a lack of a core of faculty interested in the community colleges, to begin to focus on community college leadership needs.

The University of California is the state's land-grant university. As such it has special responsibilities to respond to the needs of major institutions in the state that serve the public. Moreover, under California law, the University of California is the sole public institution that is authorized to award the doctorate and the University has zealously defended this sole prerogative when suggestions have been made that the California State University be authorized to grant doctorates in the field of education. For these reasons, we intend to work with the President of the University to explore ways that the teaching, scholarly, and public service programs of the University can help to meet the leadership challenges faced by the community colleges.

"Trustees receive excellent support from their professional associations and organizations, but have limited opportunities for in-depth education and professional development of the type necessary to enhance their leadership of community colleges in the new millennium. CCLDI offers a marvelous opportunity for trustee education and development."

Carole Currey, Member,
Board of Trustees,
Santa Monica
Community College District

leadership challenges

1. Copies of CCLDI's November 1998 Prospectus are available from the Administrative Officer.

2. The CCLDI gratefully acknowledges the financial support of the Community College League of California; the Chancellor's Office of the Community Colleges of the University of Hawaii; Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges; College of Micronesia; DeAnza College; Foothill College; Gavilan College; Guam Community College; Hawaii Community College; Honolulu Community College; Kapi'olani Community College; Kauai Community College; Leeward Community College; Maui Community College; Windward Community College; Long Beach City College; Los Rios Community College District; Merced College; MiraCosta College; Palomar College; San Diego Mesa College; San Diego City College; San Diego Community College District; San Mateo Community College District; Cañada College; College of San Mateo; Skyline College; Santa Barbara City College; State Center Community College District; Ventura Community College District; Moorpark College; Oxnard College; Ventura College; and Yuba College.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE